

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,655	09/29/2003	Vivian A. Wright	127000.0301	4783
21269 PEPPER HAM	7590 10/16/200 ILTON LLP	EXAMINER		
	CENTER, 50TH FLC	DIXON, ANNETTE FREDRICKA		
500 GRANT STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15219			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		3771	
			**	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/16/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketingpgh@pepperlaw.com

	H					
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
, ©	Advisory Action	10/674,655	WRIGHT, VIVIAN A.			
	Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Annette F. Dixon	3771			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	ne correspondence addres	ss		
THE	REPLY FILED 20 September 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THI		·			
1. 🗵	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice wing replies: (1) an amendment otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply	of Appeal. To avoid aband , affidavit, or other evidence in compliance with 37 CFR	e, which 41.31; or (3)		
b)	The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 nsions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of experiod of the second content of the se	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for later than SIX MONTHS from the man (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN (06.07(f).	ailing date of the final rejection. THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILE t 1.136(a) and the appropriate of	ED WITHIN extension fee		
unde set fo may	r 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sorth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) TICE OF APPEAL	shortened statutory period for reply r than three months after the mailing	originally set in the final Office	action; or (2) as		
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the a	of the date of appeal. Since		
AME	NDMENTS	, p				
3. ∟	 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a 	ensideration and/or search (see pw); tter form for appeal by materiall	NOTE below); y reducing or simplifying the			
4 -	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1			TOL 324)		
4. ∟ 5. □	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		-Compliant Amendment (F	101-324).		
6.			ate, timely filed amendment	canceling the		
7. 🔀	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-7. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8-15.		will be entered and an exp	planation of		
<u>AFF</u>	IDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			1		
8. 🗀	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under a _l ry and was not earlier presented	opeal and/or appellant fails See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	to provide a		
	QUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consideration because: See Continuation Sheet.			,		
_	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	- 7	7		
			JUSTINE R. YO SUPERVISORY PATENT I TECHNOLOGY CENTE			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant asserts the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a nebulizing pad comprising a flap, an absorbent core with a nebulizing agent and the flap having an adhesive coating. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions. Worthington discloses a nebulizing pad having all of the recited structural elements for dressing/covering an open wound, a tracheostoma; yet does not expressly disclose the use of a nebulizing agent. However, Burrell teaches the addition of water, a nebulizing agent, to a surgical dressing to maintain humidity thereby decreasing infection (Column 18, Lines 28-40). The combination of Worthington as modified by Burrell teaches the use of a nebulizing pad with a nebulizing agent for the purpose of controlling infection and humidity at the wound site. Thus, applicant is reminded, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Therefore, in light of the aforementioned reasoning, the rejection of claims 1-7 has been maintained.